

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment cancels Claims 1, 18 and 27-29 and amends Claims 2, 7, 13-15, 17, 19-22 and 25. Claims 2-17 and 19-26 are pending in the application. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the objections and rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 22 and 25

The Examiner objected to Claims 22 and 25 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) and alleged that the claims are of improper independent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 22 and 25 have been rewritten into independent form, so that this objection is now moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 27-29

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 27-29 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting and alleged that the claims are unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,062 in view of Lee et al. (U.S. PG-Pub. No. 2002/0033729). Claims 1 and 27-29 have been cancelled so that this rejection is now moot.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 2-17 and 22-26 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting since they depend from Claims 1 or 18. Claims 2, 7, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25 have been rewritten in independent form, so that Claims 2-17 and 22-26 no longer depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 18. The rejection of Claims 2-17 and 22-26 should be withdrawn

REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,375 to Li (“Li”). Claim 18 has been cancelled so that this rejection is now moot.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 19-21

The Examiner objected to Claims 19-21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 19 -21 have been rewritten in independent form, so that this objection is overcome.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. No fees are believed due. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 11-0855. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes/

Brenda O. Holmes, Esq.
Reg. No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 815-6500
KS File: 44471/317873